



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PHONETIC AND LEXICAL NOTES

EDWIN W. FAY*

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

1. INDO-IRANIAN TREATMENT OF IE. *k*¹s.

1. In Avestan, interior and final *k*¹s yielded š, through an intermediate stage which we may transcribe by *k*'s or šs. In behalf of the second transcription I note *-ikš-* from *išs* in Skr. *dvikṣat* (he hated), and *-iṭ* in *edhamāna-dvīṭ*.

REMARK. It is not necessary, however, to invoke the analogy of Sk. *-kṣ-<-ss-* to support the contention that IE *k*¹s (Indo-Iran. *šs*) yielded interior *kṣ* but final *ṭ*.—I see no cogent reason for accepting the theory (see Wackernagel *Ai. Gram.* § § 118; 97a) that *dvekṣi* (thou hatest) has analogical *kṣ*. The *s* of IE *esi* (thou art)=Sk. *āsi* (A) may be an earlier treatment of *-ss-* than the *ss* of *ἔσαι* (*éssai*), Plautine *ess*, Armen. *es*; (B), see Brugmann, *Gr.* 1, p. 725, Anm. It must be remembered, however, that unemphatic *esi* yields no reliable proof for the usual treatment of *-ss-*. Sk. *jōṣi* may fall under A, *dvekṣi* under B. In view of the small number of locative infinitives like *budh-i* in Sanskrit (see Macdonell's *Ved. Gram.* § 588), more heavily graded *jōṣ-i* (imperative from infinitive, type of Lat. *es-se*) is not to be excluded from the *budhī* class; cf. like variations in gradation in dative root infinitives (see Bartholomae, *Gr. Iran. Phil.* 1. § 258. 1). And who shall decide whether *śróṣi* (hear thou) is from *śru* or from *śrus*? That gen. *us-ās* (Aurorae) comes from *us-s*, reduced from IE *us-es-*, rather than directly from *us* (cf. *vy-ús-i*, at dawn), is quite incredible.

2. In Sanskrit, the rules are much more complicated: (1) Interior *k*¹s> *šs*> *kṣ* (*āvikṣmahi*, like *dvikṣat*); (2) final *k*¹s normally yielded *-šs*, whence *-ṭ* (*viṭ*, settlement, like *edhamāna-dvīṭ*); (3) but after *r* *r*, as in *dṛk spṛk ūrk*, yielded *-k*; (4) and so after dentals, by dissimilation, as in *dīk ṛtvīk* (cf. *Class. Quart.* 8. 53, noting also *-dhrk* for *-dhrṭ*). (5) After *ṇ* and *ṣ*, as in *bhiṣák* and *prá-ṇak* (but *naṭ ā-naṭ*), the product was also *-k*. (6) We find *ṭ* and *t* after *ṣṭh* in Prākritic *paṣṭhavāt* (cf. on nom. *anaḍvān* § 4).

3. The nom. *puroḍās* (fore-offering) contains *dā-* (gift), or perhaps an *s* stem, **dās*; but its lingual *ḍ* testifies to an early metaplastic nominative *-ḍāṭ* (*ḍ* by progressive assimilation). The accusative *puro-ḍāsam* (fore-honor) is metaplastic (: *dās*,

* Died Feb. 17, 1920. He had revised proof on pp. 81-102 before his death.

acclaims). Likewise *avayās* (propitiatory offering) belongs to the root *yā*; see Whitney's note on AV. 2. 35. 1, and cf. *avayānam* (propitiation). Vedic *an-āk* (eyeless) has IE. *k^w*.

2. THE PHONETICS OF SKR. *anaḍūd-bhyas*.

4. The problem is to trace the phonetic development of the Proto-Indo-Iranian weak stem *anas-ug^h-*. This I do briefly as follows: by exterior euphony the compound *anas-ug^h-* yielded *anaz-užh-*, whence by assimilation *anaž-užh-* and next, with continued assimilation, abl. **anaḍ-ud-bhyas*, loc. **anaḍuṣu*, subsequently dissimilated to *anaḍūd-bhyas* etc. The proper nominative, still reckoning with the accomplished dissimilation, would have been **anaḍvāt*, voc. **ánaḍvat*, with euphonic forms in *-vān* before initial nasals. To the generalisation of these euphonic forms the synonymous vocatives of *vṛṣan* and *úkṣan* (bull) would have contributed, though Whitney's metaplastic stem *anaḍvānt* (possessing a wagon) is not inadmissible.—Uhlenbeck's prius *anarḍ-* is bare assumption; and the Indra epithet *ánarviś-* in RV. 1. 121. 7 might mean, as Ludwig realizes in his note, a thousand other things than *car-borne* (pace Johansson in *BB* 18. 17). Perhaps the epithet is a bahuvrihi, with shifted (? ultimately vocative) accent, from haplogenic *anar[vá]-viś-* (having a limitless dwelling, dwelling in infinity).

3. CRITIQUE OF *JAOS* 38. 206-207.

5. Professor Edgerton has made a just, if somewhat harsh, criticism of Uhlenbeck's 'etymology' of Skr. *lāti* (takes). He has also found for *ādeśa* the sense of *salutation*. Against his derivation of these words from a Hindi dialect I have reservations; nor can I believe that, in noting Hindi *lena*, the lexicon of Monier Williams intended to represent *lena* as the source of *lāti*, but rather to say that *lāti* and *lena* derived from a common Prākritic source.

6. As for the verb *lāti*, Fröhde correctly placed it long ago (*BB* 20. 212) with the sept of Greek *λάρων* (wage). But Fröhde's definition was defective. As it is reflected, after Walde, in Boisacq (s. v. *λάρων*), *lēi* (noun and verb) meant 'possession, to accord to one'; in the middle, 'to acquire, gain.' We come out better with the one definition of *to take*. [Giving is a reciprocal act. For the receiver it is a taking (cf. Eng. *takings* = money

taken in business, receipts).] In Homer (see the passages in Fröhde's article), ἀλῆος means 'without one's takings,—a due share in'; λάτρον is the share of the earner, and Lat. *latro* has come clearly back to 'taker.' The IE. root (s)lēi (? enlargement of *sel* in ελεῖν) appears as *slā*, expanded by various determinatives in ἑλλαβε (λήφεται) and λάζεται. Skr. *rābhate* preserves a trace of the original diphthong in pf. *rebhe* (see *AJP* 39. 293) and *i* is also revealed in *-ripsu* (cited by Whitney); cf. (with *i*) λαυήρως (rapidus). Between *lātuvā* (with) and λαβών a close parallel obtains. Was Lat. *lētum* originally a *taking off*?

7. As regards *ādeśa* in the sense of *salutation* (cf. Eng. *bid* = invitation and 'I bid you good-day'), I am even further from being convinced. In the context it seems not unlikely that *ādeśam dattvā* etc., introducing the interview of a great king with a sage, meant merely 'the king having given a signal <to proceed> was saluted by the sage'; and note in the lexica that *ā + dīś* is defined by *nominare* (benennen). Granting the definition, however, this sense may have been suggested for *ādeśa* to any user of the cry of greeting (? or salutation at departure), *diṣṭyā*; cf. *diṣṭi-vrddhi* (congratulation).—In regard to the formula of etiquette *diṣṭyā vardhase*, I hesitate between the standard interpretation as *salute augeris* and a more archaic *salute appellaris* (*vardhase* : Lat. *verbum*). The salutation *diṣṭyā* (*salve*; lit. with homage) is to be derived from *dāśnóti* (does homage).

8. Likewise *ādeśa*, if it means *greeting*, may belong by honest descent to the sept of *dāśnóti*, for I take it that, given a colloquial survival of Sanskrit, a word (*lāti*) or, in a formula (*ādeśam dattvā*), a definition of most archaic nature may emerge as late classical Sanskrit, or even in a restricted dialect, that of the Southern recension of Professor Edgerton's text. In point of derivation *ādeśa* may belong, like *diṣṭyā*, to a very interesting group. The original root was *dē(i)k¹*, with long interior diphthong; and the cognates exhibit a rather rich vowel gradation, e. g. *dāśati* (acclaims, does homage, greets, offers, consecrates); *dīkṣā*, consecration (this is, to the best of my knowledge, a new derivation); *ādeśa* (? salutation). There is also in RV. 6. 56. 1 the reduplicated stem *dīdeś-*:

yá enam ādīdeśati karambhād iti pūṣānam | ná téna devá ādīše:
qui hunc salutat 'Pultiphagus' nomine Pushanem | non ei deus
salutando <est>.

In Homer the root *dēik*¹ is of social rather than sacral import: *δείκνυται* (salutes, welcomes, pledges with a cup); and in the same sense *δεικανόωντο δειδίσκετο* (: *δεδισκόμενος*). Nor must we any longer, under the spell of the phonetic system that obtained prior to the elucidation of the long diphthong series, follow Wackernagel (*BB* 4. 269) in the mischievous correction to *δήκνυται*. In Latin, the *i* of the diphthong has been lost altogether in *decus*, honor (: Skr. *daśasyāti*); but *dicat* (consecrates) and *dignus* (honored, honorable > worthy) contain it; cf. *ἀρι-δείκετος* and see *AJP* 31. 415. A secondary root *dek*¹s remains in RV. in impv. *dakṣatā* (do homage), construed (as sometimes *dāś*) with dative of receiver.

9. That the root *dēik*¹ (acclaim) is anything but a specialized aspect of the root written *deik*¹ (to point out, show, in Skr. *diś*), or conversely, I cannot believe. Clue enough to the special sense is furnished by the Aeschylean compound *δακτυλό-δεικτος* (= *digitis monstratus* > honored, conspicuous). I also compare our Biblical *shew-bread*. Personally I think that in the sept of *dāśati* the long diphthong series is archaic in the sacral and social word, and is older than the short diphthong series of *dico*, *δείκνυμι*. The reduplication of *δειδίσκετο* is the intensive reduplication of Skr. *dēdiṣṭe* (displays), formally* allocated to *diś* instead of *dāś*. Again, we should not correct to *δηδίσκετο*.

HINDIISMS IN SANSKRIT AGAIN: A REPLY TO PROFESSOR FAY

FRANKLIN EDGERTON

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

MY DERIVATION of *ādeśa*, 'salutation,' from Hindi (or some related dialect) *ādes* evidently goes very much against the grain with Professor Fay; for he thinks of at least three distinct and alternative ways of avoiding it. It puzzles me to discover why the suggestion should seem to him *a priori* so improbable, as apparently it does. But of that later. Let me first consider his alternative suggestions.

1. He thinks *ādeśam dattvā* need not mean 'giving a saluta-